

REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's thorough consideration provided the present application. Claims 1-10 are now present in the application. Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 7-10 have been added. Claim 1 is independent. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Disclosure (FIG. 1), in view of Guehler, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2001/0010884. Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Disclosure (FIG. 1) in view of Guehler, and further in view of Umemoto, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2001/0030724. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

In light of the foregoing amendments to the claims, Applicant respectfully submits that these rejections have been obviated and/or rendered moot. As the Examiner will note, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite a combination of elements including "a first anti-reflection coating formed on the lower transparent substrate and adjacent to the translucent reflecting layer". Support for the above combination of elements can be found in FIG. 2 of the instant application as originally filed. Applicant respectfully submits that the above combination of elements as set forth in amended independent claim 1 is not disclosed nor suggested by the references relied on by the Examiner.

The Examiner has correctly acknowledged that Applicant's Disclosure in FIG. 1 fails to disclose a first anti-reflection coating. Therefore, Applicant's Disclosure in FIG. 1 also fails to

teach “a first anti-reflection coating formed on the lower transparent substrate and adjacent to the translucent reflecting layer” as recited in amended claim 1.

Although Guehler on paragraph 0038 discloses that an anti-reflection coating can be within the donor element, the donor element is not a part of the liquid crystal display. In fact, Guehler’s donor element is simply for transferring black matrix material or for selective thermal mass transfer of color filter material (see paragraph 0081). Therefore, Guehler also fails to “a first anti-reflection coating formed on the lower transparent substrate and adjacent to the translucent reflecting layer” as recited in amended claim 1.

With regard to the Examiner’s reliance on Umemoto, this reference has only been relied on for its teachings related to the subject matter of dependent claim 5. This reference also fails to disclose the above combination of elements as set forth in amended independent claim 1. Accordingly, this reference fails to cure the deficiencies of Guehler.

Accordingly, none of the references utilized by the Examiner individually or in combination teach or suggest the limitations of amended independent claim 1 or its dependent claims. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 and its dependent claims clearly define over the teachings of the references relied on by the Examiner.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are respectfully requested.

Additional Claims

Additional claims 7-10 have been added for the Examiner’s consideration.

Dependent claim 7 recites “the first anti-reflection coating is above the lower substrate and below the translucent reflecting layer.” Dependent claims 8 and 9 recite “the first anti-reflection coating contacts a top surface of the lower substrate.” Support for claims 7-9 can be found in FIG. 2 of the instant application as originally filed. As mentioned, Guehler’s donor element is not a part of the liquid crystal display. Therefore Guehler fails to teach that the anti-reflection coating is above the lower substrate and below the translucent reflecting layer as recited in claim 7 and that the anti-reflection coating contacts a top surface of the lower substrate as recited in claims 8 and 9.

Dependent claim 10 recites “a refraction rate of the adhesive layer is lower than a refraction rate of the lower substrate to avoid a total internal reflection”. Support for claim 10 can be found on the paragraph beginning on page 5, line 6 of the instant application as originally filed. Although Umemoto discloses using an adhesive layer to fix the anti-reflection layer to the visual side surface of the LCD panel (see paragraph 0028), Umemoto fails to disclose that a refraction rate of the adhesive layer is lower than a refraction rate of the lower substrate to avoid a total internal reflection as recited in claim 10.

Favorable consideration and allowance of additional claims 7-10 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Joe McKinney Muncy, Registration No. 32,334 at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: January 24, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 

Joe McKinney Muncy

Reg. No. 32,334

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P. O. Box 747

Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant

